



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,898	10/10/2000	Yosuke Shirata	980511B	2212

7590 10/28/2003
ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI
McLELAND & NAUGHTON
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N. W.
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUNG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2851

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/684,898	SHIRATA, YOSUKE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung Henry V Nguyen	2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 8/11/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17, 19-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17 and 19-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/055,954.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-692) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17 and 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al (U.S.Pat. 5,871,587).

With respect to claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17, and 19-30, Hasegawa discloses a processing system/method comprising substantially all of the limitations as claimed such as: an exposure device (121-124) for projecting a pattern formed on a reticle onto a substrate; a first chamber (101) for containing the exposure apparatus; a substrate processing apparatus (131, 132) provided adjacent to the exposure apparatus; a second chamber (130) provided adjacent to the first chamber separately from the first chamber and which encloses the substrate processing apparatus; a purity sensor (110) for detecting the data regarding the purity of gas discharged from second chamber (130) and based on the detection, the capacity of gas purification to be supplied into the first chamber is controlled via a controller and adjustment device (106, 111, 112). Thus, in general, Hasegawa teaches two different apparatuses, e.g., a substrate processing apparatus and an exposure apparatus in a substrate processing system, which are located adjacent to each other for consecutive processing operations. In particular, Hasegawa teaches a concept of adjusting/controlling the parameters (for instance, the capacity of gas purification) of the

exposure apparatus (apparatus A) based on the data collected from the substrate processing apparatus (apparatus B). Hasagawa does not expressly disclose controlling the environment of the exposure A (based on the measured data detected from the exposure B) such that the environment of at least a portion on a side of the apparatus A (exposure apparatus) becomes **the SAME** as the environment of at least a portion on a side of the apparatus B (substrate processing apparatus). However, Hasagawa further suggests that the helium purity of the exposure apparatus (apparatus A) is adjusted to be not lower than 99.9% based on the purity of the helium detected from the substrate processing apparatus (apparatus B) (see col.5, lines 48-56). In view of such teachings, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hasegawa to come up with the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to adjust the environmental condition (such as temperature, humidity or pressure) of at least a portion on the side of the substrate processing apparatus/or exposure apparatus as **the SAME** as the environmental condition of at least a portion of the exposure apparatus/or substrate processing apparatus (for example: temperature, humidity, or pressure) based on the obtaining data (such as temperature, humidity or pressure) from the exposure apparatus/or substrate processing apparatus. The motivation of doing so would have been to keep the environment of both apparatuses at an identical desired condition and thus to improve the accuracy and quality of the exposure/ or substrate processing system.

Response to Amendment/Argument

3. Applicant's amendment filed August 11, 2003 have been entered. Claims 7, 14 have been cancelled. New claim 30 has been added and claims 1, 5, 12, 20, 23 and 26-28 have been amended. Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art have been carefully reviewed but they are not found persuasive. Applicants argued that "Hasegawa does not control the purity of gas supplied into apparatus A such that the purity of gas in apparatus A becomes the SAME as the purity of gas in apparatus B"; the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants. Hasegawa meets the limitations of the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) since Hasegawa does suggest that the helium purity of the exposure apparatus (apparatus A) is adjusted to be not lower than 99.9% based on the purity of the helium detected from the substrate processing apparatus (apparatus B) (see col.5, lines 48-56).

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Henry V Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-6462. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (First Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russ Adams can be reached on 703-308-2847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4900.

hvn
10/20/03



HENRY HUNG NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER